THE 'NAMELESS' !

-BY-

MIKKEL DAHL

dedicated

to that multitude of devout Christians who love their Lord; yet fearful lest they offend their Redeemer by not using His proper name in prayer and conversation.

LOOK
THINK and
UNDERSTAND!

— the author.

THE NAMELESS

Of late years there has been an increasing amount of ado about the name of the Creator. Is it God, Jehovah, or what? Should we not refer to Him in conversation by His proper name? And in prayer, should we not address Him by His proper name?

These are questions which arise in the mind of many, and especially so of late years because the issue has been violently stirred up by a number of persons, whose interest it has been to make an issue of this point. Therefore, is this brief article written, that those who have been disturbed in mind may come to understand.

There was a small town editor in Italy who kept hammering away at social injustices - until he got a hearing and a following. Then he stuck out his jaw and feigned leadership: he got it - and led his people into a mess and disaster. His name was Benito Mussolini.

Shortly before the days of Mussolini, a certain Lenin came back to his native Russia when his country was in the doldrums of war. The mass mind was easily inflamed, so, soon followed the revolution. Lenin and his successors also feigned the powers of leadership, and were lavish in their promises unto the people. What has it netted Russia and the world? A tyranny, the likes of which has never previously been recorded in the annals of humankind!

Shortly after the advent of Communism arose an unknown painter in Germany: even like Balaam's ass, he found his tongue and inflamed the passions of his people. His scapegoat was the Jew. What did he profit his people? Thruout the few mad years of his reign, he eliminated unemployment by channelling all the resources of his country unto the preparation for war. He murdered about 6,000,000 Jews. He brought on World War II, and left his country in the most sorry plight Germany has ever had the sorrow to experience. Similarly has been the verdict of history back thru the centuries.

Yet what has this to do with the name of the Creator? To goad you to think! Persons with crackpot ideas but void of true spirituality, and lacking in other worthwhile qualities, start haranguing to work up the passions of the people and to attract unto themselves the simple, the credulous, the gullible, and worthless. Thru this nucleus, they build up a following and get their own egos inflated, that they may live in a world of their own self-importance and receive the adulation of the unthinking masses.

Now, for a great many years there has been a growing unrest within the organized churches: people have commenced to question and also to become apathetic. So, within the world of religion have arisen the counterparts to Hitler. Since they are completely void of spiritual understanding, and have absolutely nothing of worth to offer anyone, they have seized on some "scapegoat" to attract attention and draw a following. Among such

have arisen 'the name of God cult,' chief among which, I believe, is the cult of "Yahweh."

You, who have been misled by such bunco, induced to believe that the Creator has a specific name which must be used, tell me this: who were His parents that christened Him? Should you reply that He had no parents to christen Him, then who were His peers to necessitate a name being given to the Creator to distinguish Him from the others? The situation you imply by the correct name of the Creator, becomes precisely what I have said: He had parents to christen Him, or, He was only one among many peers so that He required an identifying handle.

It becomes on par to saying that a farmer has a name so that he will know we are talking to him instead of one of the pigs or the goats, the horses, or the bulls, or the rams!

When we postulate a creator, by whose word the entire cosmos came into being; when we concede that He was the first and only, before whom and with whom there were none - until He spoke the creative fiat, then we only advertise our mental vacuum by postulating that such a being must have a name! It is even like saying that a scientist and inventor who constructs a number of robots, must adopt a name or be given a name so that he will know we are speaking to him instead of to one of the contraptions, or that he may be properly discerned from them!

Who can name the nameless?

Yet the credulous come back to voice their simplicity: "But has not the Creator revealed His name unto us? Surely He has a name!

An infant is born: in course of time He commences to speak. At first He knows the parents by mama and dad while somewhat later it becomes mother and father (which words have more meaning). Those words denote a relationship.

Back in the days of humanity's infancy, when man was aware of God even as a child is of the parent, the Creator was known as the Father. That name ("Our Father who art in heaven") has come down thru the centuries and is still with us. Those of us who believe the Bible and who have arrived at the first base of spiritual understanding, are keenly aware of this one fact that He who is sometimes called God, is the Father of the spirit indwelling man. Therefore it is right and proper that we call Him Father. (See Zech 12:1; Heb 12:9)

As we continue further along the way of humanity's spiritual childhood, God manifested a portion of His power unto certain chosen servants - like Noah and Abraham. In their ancient language, the word for power, strength, or might was El. So, the name of God became Eloah meaning "the Mighty One." Its plural form is Elohim. That is the "name" which Moses used two and a half millenniums later when recording the "story of creation." In the said account he used the plural form (Elohim) to indicate that the "Alpha" had begotten another perfect being whom we may properly call the "Son." They constituted the "Elohim." So, the Elohim spoke, saying "Let there

be light." Altho we may rightly conclude that the entirety of creation involved much; such as wisdom, justice, righteousness, yet unto all conscious creation the outstanding factor was: power! Hence the Eloah and Elohim.

A little later we come across the form of El Shaddai which, in our common versions have usually been rendered "God Almighty." To the average mind, that may be close enough, but not the precise meaning, The El is power, while the Shaddai is sufficiency. So unto those with an understanding of the language, it was He who had sufficient power for all occasions. Yet none of these were names of God, for He has none! They were only "handles" used by man.

When this great being manifested to Moses out of the burning bush, Moses asked Him point-blank "What is your name?" God was not able to answer that question - for He had no name! So He simply said "I am that I am!" That was a statement, but not a "name."

In the days of Moses in Egypt, as well as in other lands at that time, there were a multiplicity of "gods." "According to the cities, so were their gods." It was the spirit of demonism. So the Eloah which manifested unto Moses wanted to impress upon the consciousness of His chosen people, that there was but one true Creator and only one true "God." So He revealed unto Moses a "handle" which would inculcate the thought of one God, and help the people to rise above demonism as was fostered thru the practice of a multiplicity

of gods. So close as we can come to it today, that word was Yahweh, while the closest meaning we can arrive at for that word is "the self-existent One." Some nations had gods who were born unto other gods, while others had them of wood, stone, and precious metals: all being gods for this or for that (such as the god of harvest, the god of fertility, the god of fisheries, the god of war, and what-nots). But this handle meaning the "self-existent One", did in itself imply that all other gods were but inventions and vanity - of no account.

Thereafter, to Moses, and the priesthood which he instituted, the Eloah was known as Yahweh, but with much sacredness and awe attached. So in conversation, the hybrid name of Jehovah came into usage.

After people came to know more about their God thru the law and the teachings of the priesthood, those who took their Yahweh to heart, and in sincerity tried to follow Him, commenced to call Him Adoni: it simply means Lord or Master. In another tongue it was Baal - which has precisely the same meaning, even as our English Lord. But the people who worshipped Baal did not know the true God: Baal was but an idol - but another vagary of demonism.

Then arrived the day when the Messiah came unto the chosen people. According to our common versions He was named Jesus, which is a Latinized corruption of the Greek Iāsous. There appears plenty of good evidence to indicate that the name He was christened was Yahoshua. The first

part thereof was the basic shortened form of Yahweh, while its last part is the Hebrew for preserver, which, in our common versions of today is usually rendered, Redeemer and Saviour. To be sure, the son of Mary was given a name, and that name signified that the spirit of Yahweh had come unto His people to preserve or to redeem them. He was the Messiah! That explains the countless repetitions of "believing in His name." That is believing that He was the incarnate Yahweh-spirit come to redeem the entire nation.

But with Yahoshua as with His people, long names soon received a shorter form. Thus we find many variants, such as Hosea, Joshua, Jeshuah, Jeshu, Jesus. It is the same in English and other languages. One is born Alexander but goes thru life as Sandy, another is born Richard, but answers to Dick the rest of his life.

If, in conversation and maybe in prayer, you wish to use the word Yahoshua, well, that's your privilege. I grew up to know and love the name of Jesus, which to me, means precisely the same as Yahoshua meant to the mother of the Lord. But because I was not brot up in the Hebrew, I find such names cumbersome and with less meaning to me than are those with which I have been long familiar. But regardless of the instance, we must understand that we cannot name The Nameless, except to give it a "handle" to convey a certain meaning unto ourselves. As in this very instance with which we are dealing, the Yahoshua conveyed the completed thot: the promise fulfilled: Yahweh arrived to redeem His people!

Why do not the credulous who are fearful of using the wrong name of God, call Him "Jealous"? Clearly we are told in Ex. 34:14, that "His name is Jealous." Presumably they have sufficient intelligence to realize that God in that instance wished to convey the thot that it was He and He alone who should be worshipped; but when it comes to half a dozen other "handles" of the same nature - merely to convey a thot and a relationship, they have no spiritual discernment whatever.

God. It is the English form of practically the same word in many other languages. It is used freely with reference to the Creator. But its true meaning is that of Keeper. It is the great Father in charge of His spirit children who, even like unto an earthly father, looks after his own little ones. Hence, when we understand the true meaning of the word God, it becomes a very beautiful and lovable name for our true heavenly Father, for indeed, He is our "Keeper"!

Sometimes I wonder if these credulous ones have ever read Rev. 3: 12? Here it is - in part: "And I will write upon Him my new name." This clearly implies that by that time, He will have received a "new name." If God - the nameless, had a name to begin with, or at any time, then that is His name and He can never have a new name. For, "God changes not." To postulate that He has a proper name, but that He will take another one at some time in the future, relegates God to the category of fickle, worthless man who changes his name because he doesn't like it - or maybe to get out of a jam. But so soon as we come into the true

understanding that the Creator never has had and never will have any name, then it makes sense. When our great God and Saviour has completed the work of redemption: that is, the fruit thereof brot in, then shall His people know Him by a "new name" for, the relationship to His people will be changed.

It is the same in our earthly relationships, for, we were "made in the image of God and after His likeness." At first it is mama - pappa, later that shortens to mom and dad. Then mother and father. While the true son, - maybe in his 30's, encounters his father after a long absence and will perhaps, put his arms about him and say "My father." We have evolved no expression beyond that. But to the true son who knows a good father, those two words mean so much: not merely the man who did beget him, but the one who lived and sacrificed on the lad's account, the one who was his sustainer and keeper, the one who was his friend and counselor, the one who loved him, and was his all. . . .

So similarly when man is come to spiritual maturity, he will understand the depth and the width and the height of the marvellous work of redemption wrought for us by the Son of God; therefore will He receive "a new name."

When translating the ancient Scriptures into English, the Eloah and Elohim were rendered "God." This is as good as any, in view of the fact that the true meaning of the word has not been known to the sons of man. They think of that as

but another name for the Creator, even as they do of Jehovah, Yahweh, Adoni, and other handles which have been used by man. When Scripture is read thoughtfully, we come accross many instances where the common concept of the word "God," or the Lord God makes no sense when applying it. This holds true both to the old and new testaments. As for instance, "I am the Lord - that brought you out of the land of Egypt to be your God" (Lev. 22: 32 - 33). This, and other similar numerous passages, prove that the word has a meaning rather than being a true name. Bear in mind as you read Scripture, the true meaning of that word (Keeper), and you will find that it fits in every instance. Time and again you will find the word used conditionally: that is, under certain conditions He will be their "God." Especially do they abound thruout the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah. Even in the final book of the New Testament, and almost at its very end, is another similar instance: "He that overcomes shall inherit all things, and I will be his God and he shall be My son" (Rev. 21: 7). In countless such instances you will find that we are not dealing with a proper noun, but only with a "handle" which conveys a meaning to us. Naturally, the ineffable Creator: that great being who was before all and who in truth was "the first cause"; has never had and never will have a name. Names are given for the purpose of identification. What! Does the Creator need to be identified? When a little raindrop comes falling out of a cloud above the Pacific Ocean, do you suppose he would ever think of saying to a fellow traveller "Who is that down below us?" There is no simil-

arity except in basic substance, therefore the little raindrop could only say one word: mother!

In print, it is the Bible which brings the revelation of God to man, so let us once more look at it thoughtfully. If the 'first cause' has a name, instead of handles which convey a meaning, we certainly would find it in Scripture. But instead, we find but numerous expressions which convey a meaning. Such as "Lord of Hosts": today in common parlance we might say "the big boss", or, to fit the case more perfectly it would be the "General" (over many armies) as in the time of great war. Then we find other expressions such as the Eternal, the Everlasting, the Judge and the "Holy One of Israel."

Look back to the prophet Isaiah 9: 6: "Unto us a child is born --- and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace". That was the great God speaking thru His prophet-mouthpiece: surely He could have given us His name if He had one. Instead we find but an adjective and a few nouns, but no proper name.

Listen to this: "I am Gabriel who stands in the presence of God - ." Do you not suppose the archangel knew the name of his Master - assuming that Master had one? But no! Gabriel used only words which had a meaning, such as Keeper, Master, the self-existent one, the mighty one. Similarly, some months later when the same archangel appeared unto Mary, he failed to use any "proper name" to designate Him whom we call

God. But unto her he twice used an adjective in the sense of a noun: the Highest! (See 1st chapter of Luke's gospel.) No doubt there were devout Jews, both so fearful and simple that they dreaded to utter the word which they thought of as the name of Him who manifested unto Moses out of the burning bush. But assuredly Gabriel the archangel would not be afraid to speak the name of his Master - if that Lord and Master of his had one.

Stop to think! Do you not realize that it is like spitting in the face of God, to postulate that He has a name? As I have already said, a name is but for one purpose, to identify: to distinguish one from another in conversation. How utterly absurd and senseless to postulate that the "Alpha" should require identification!

Now let us check back to the gospel of St. Mark, who relates the incident of the demoniac whom Jesus restored to his right mind (See chapter five). Here it was not a man talking to Jesus, but the demon within him speaking thru the lips of the person he was possessing. Because that spirit was a demon (not an earthling): that is, a native citizen of the spirit world, he immediately recognized Jesus and knew the identity of the spirit indwelling the Nazarene (see verse 7). Do you suppose that demon spirit had any scruples about articulating the "proper name" of God? But again, true to the pattern: he used only words with meanings. "Thou son of the most high God." What stands out here is the "most high." So soon as we place those words before God, that immediately implies that the word is not a proper noun, but on-

ly a word with a meaning - such as boss, Lord, Master, Keeper. St. Luke's account of the same incident fully corroborates the situation. According to him, the demon used precisely the same words except slightly transposed.

Do you not suppose that the Son knew His Father's name - assuming the Father had a name? But we find on the contrary that Jesus used only words in the sense of a noun: words which had a meaning. In Luke 6: 35, we find that Jesus used the same expression as Gabriel, referring to the Father as the "Highest."

Once more let us turn back to the prophet Isaiah but now Chapter 14. In verse 12, Lucifer is referred to as the "son of the morning." That expression implies that Lucifer was no youngster, but rather that he had come into being back in the distantly dim and misty eons of the past, when the Great First Cause entered into active manifestation. So, even as with Jesus (the son of God), surely Lucifer would know the right name of God. . . . . Or do you suppose that the master demon himself might be afraid to utter the name of God? How fantastic! There is no object in a name if it must never be spoken!

Aside from Jesus and Gabriel, there is no one referred to in Scripture that would more logically know the proper name of God than Lucifer. And surely, no one aside from the Son himself, would be more certain to use the proper name of God than Lucifer would - if indeed God has a name. But what does Lucifer say? Look: "I will ascend

above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High"!

Search the Scripture both old and new, and you shall utterly fail to find the "proper name" of God - for He has none. But true to the word I have warned you: within the field of religion, there has been and are "racketeers", and the unscrupulous and vicious - even as in the political world, we had dictators, and fanatics who have brought grief and shame unto their people and tragedy unto the world. They know absolutely nothing (of true worth); they are full of words, worldly and unscrupulous in their ambition. When it comes to the "right name of God" cult, they haven't the flimsiest peg on which to stand. And when they speak, it is but an ill wind whistling thru empty skull bones. . . .

WHEN - of all occasions, should it be of the greatest importance, to speak the "proper name" of God? When we pray to Him! There can be no other time of greater magnitude.

Yet when the Lord's disciples requested that He teach them to pray, what "name" did He use?

> "Our FATHER who art in heaven,
> hallowed be thy name, - - - - -."

Yet today the unscrupulous have the gall to infer that they know better than that which was taught and exemplified by the very Son of God - to rope in the simple, the good and credulous!

Today it matters not if you speak English, German or Latin, if, even in a measure you know your spirit Father in heaven: when your heart and thots flow out to Him, it matters not if you call Him Yahweh or God, Adoni, Lord, or Saviour, Yahoshua, Joshua, Jeshuah, Jeshu, or Jesus: your thots are given wings by your emotions, your love flows out to your Father in heaven and He receives that. It matters not one iota what "name" you think you should use or which you use, for you cannot call The Nameless by His proper name, since He never had a name!

Little children, have you understood?

Look and Learn!

PUBLISHED BY
DAWN OF TRUTH
996 DROUILLARD RD., WINDSOR, ONT., CAN.

CHANNELED BY
MIKKEL DAHL INC.
998 DROUILLARD RD., WINDSOR, ONT., CAN.